

City of Dublin Administrative Review Team

Planning Report

Thursday, September 15, 2016

73 S. Riverview Street – Exterior Modifications

Case Summary

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Case Number | 16-073ARB-MPR |
| Proposal | Construct a new single-family dwelling for a property within the Bridge Street Historic Residential District at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. |
| Request | Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066, 153.070 and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> . |
| Site Location | 73 S. Riverview Street. |
| Owner | Floyd Tackett, Tackett Custom Carpentry, LTD |
| Case Manager | J.M. Rayburn, Planner I (614) 410-4653; jrayburn@dublin.oh.us |
| ART Recommendation | <p>Based on the proposal, the proposed modifications meet the criteria of the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> and Zoning Code and approval is recommended with two conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) That the proposed color scheme is chosen from a historic palette and is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood.2) That the landscape design of the site is consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on and adjacent to the site. |

| Facts | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Description | 0.26 acre |
| Zoning | BSD-HR, Historic Residential District |
| Surrounding Zoning and Uses | North, East, and South: BSD-HR, Historic Residential District West: BSD-HC, Historic Core District |
| Site Features | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single-family home setback approximately 20 feet from Eberly Hill Road and approximately 25 feet from South Riverview Street. • A detached two-car garage with two storage bays is located along the rear property line in the northwestern corner of the site. |
| Case History | <p>July 27th, 2016 The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed the proposed demolition of an existing single-family resident and associated detached garage. The Board approved the demolition of the detached garage and disapproved the demolition of the single-family residence.</p> <p>August 24, 2016 The ARB approved a request for reconsideration to review the demolition of existing single-family residence. The Board subsequently approved the demolition with two conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That the demolition does not occur until the ARB approves a proposed design for the single-family residence; and 2) That the demolition does not occur until building permits are issued. |

| Details | | Exterior Modifications |
|--------------|---|------------------------|
| Proposal | The proposal is construct a new single-family dwelling for a property within the Bridge Street Historic Residential District at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. | |
| Site Layout | The proposed site features a one and a half story, single-family residence and attached garage centered on the lot with a 3,169-square-foot building footprint falling mostly on the eastern portion, which is oriented toward S. Riverview Street. Such an orientation designates S. Riverview Street as the principle frontage street. Pedestrian access is shown from S. Riverview Street via a front paver walkway. Vehicular access is shown from Eberly Hill Lane via a driveway to the attached garage located to the rear of the single-family residence. | |
| Site Details | <p><i>Lot Area and Width</i> The proposed development is located on a 0.26-acre lot that is approximately 172 feet deep by 66 feet wide, which meets the Code required minimum 0.22 lot area and minimum lot depth of 60 feet with 60 feet of frontage along a public right-of-way.</p> <p><i>Building Height</i> The proposed height is 27 feet and 10 inches, which meets the Code maximum of 35 feet height.</p> | |

| Details | | Exterior Modifications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|----|------|-----|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----|----------------------|----|----|-----|
| | <i>Lot Coverage</i> Code permits 50% lot coverage for all principal and accessory structures and impervious surfaces on the site, unless otherwise approved by the Architectural Review Board. The proposal includes a combined lot coverage of 32.3%. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Minimum Setbacks</i> Code requires minimum building setbacks based on named street frontages. ART established S. Riverview Street as the principle frontage street. S. Blacksmith and Eberly Hill are designated as the rear and side streets, respectively. The required setbacks are as follows: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table><tr><th colspan="4">Minimum Setbacks</th></tr><tr><th>Location</th><th>Permitted (ft.)</th><th>Proposed (ft.)</th><th>Requirement</th></tr><tr><td>Front (S. Riverview)</td><td>20</td><td>23.9</td><td>Met</td></tr><tr><td>Side (Eberly Hill)</td><td>3, total of 12</td><td>18 and 10, total 28</td><td>Met</td></tr><tr><td>Rear (S. Blacksmith)</td><td>15</td><td>56</td><td>Met</td></tr></table> | | | Minimum Setbacks | | | | Location | Permitted (ft.) | Proposed (ft.) | Requirement | Front (S. Riverview) | 20 | 23.9 | Met | Side (Eberly Hill) | 3, total of 12 | 18 and 10, total 28 | Met | Rear (S. Blacksmith) | 15 | 56 | Met |
| | Minimum Setbacks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Location | Permitted (ft.) | Proposed (ft.) | Requirement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Front (S. Riverview) | 20 | 23.9 | Met | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Side (Eberly Hill) | 3, total of 12 | 18 and 10, total 28 | Met | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rear (S. Blacksmith) | 15 | 56 | Met | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architectural Details | <p>The proposed house is a Craftsman-style one and a half story bungalow. Features include a wide open front porch with double columns and stone base, a front-facing shed dormer, shake siding and dimensional shingle roofing. The east elevation has windows flanking the front door and a prominent shed dormer above the porch. The dormer features eave brackets and cedar shingles.</p> <p>The change of materials breaks up the north and south elevations. The north elevation facing Eberly Hill Lane features a masonry chimney, gabled ends, and windows. The attached garage is shown with different primary materials consisting of board and batten siding and a metal roof to suggest it was added on to the residential building at a later date.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Materials and Colors | <p>A thin-cut stone veneer is shown at the base of the house on the north, south and east elevation. All of the proposed windows are Stone White aluminum clad-wood windows.</p> <p>The east elevation has a mix of materials including shake siding on the main house and dormer, dimensional asphalt shingles, 8x8 double columns with stone bases, cedar wood brackets, aluminum gutters, and a thin-cut stone veneer lining the base of the building.</p> <p>The north and south elevations include a mix of materials that feature shake siding and dimensional asphalt shingles on the main house, board and batten siding and metal roofing on the garage structure, and a masonry chimney incorporated on each elevation.</p> <p>The applicant has made color selections for each of the materials. It is unclear if these colors are derived from a historic palette and is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Analysis Exterior Modifications | |
|---|--|
| Process | Section 153.070 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval of a Board Order for proposals within the Architectural Review District Boundaries (full text of criteria attached). Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria. |
| General Review Standards | |
| 1) <i>Character and Materials Compatible with Context.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed changes are appropriate for the character of the neighborhood, and meet Code and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> . |
| 2) <i>Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed modifications do not alter the historic significance of the site or building. |
| 3) <i>Compatible with Relevant Design Characteristics.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed improvements are appropriate and historically compatible. The proposed composite shake siding, dimensional asphalt shingle, shingled roofing, stone veneer, trim and finishing are compatible with the character of adjacent buildings. |
| 4) <i>Appropriate Massing and Building Form.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed building massing and form are compatible and appropriate with neighborhood character. |
| 5) <i>Appropriate Color Scheme</i> | Criterion met with condition: The proposed color scheme is chosen from a historic palette and is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood. |
| 6) <i>Complementary Sign Design</i> 7) <i>Appropriate Landscape Design</i> 8) <i>Preservation of archaeological resources</i> | Criterion met with condition: The landscape design of the site is consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on and adjacent to the site. |

| Alteration to Buildings, Structure, and Site | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1) <i>Reasonable Effort to Minimize Alteration of Buildings and Site.</i> | Not applicable. |

| Alteration to Buildings, Structure, and Site | |
|--|---|
| 2) <i>Conformance to Original Distinguishing Character.</i> | Not applicable. |
| 3) <i>Retention of Historic Building Features and Materials.</i> | Not applicable. |
| 4) <i>Alteration Recognizes Historic Integrity and Appropriateness.</i> | Not applicable. |
| 5) <i>Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.</i> | Not applicable. |
| 6) <i>Sensitive Treatment of Distinctive Features.</i> | Not applicable. |
| 7) <i>Appropriate Repair or Replacement of Significant Architectural Features.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed composite shake siding, dimensional asphalt shingle, shingled roofing, stone veneer, trim and finishing are compatible with the character of adjacent buildings. |
| 8) <i>Sensitively Maintained Historic Building Materials.</i> | Not applicable. |

| Minor Project Review Criteria | |
|---|--|
| Process | The Administrative Review Team has reviewed this application based on the following review criteria for Minor Projects, which include the following: |
| c) <i>Meets Applicable Zoning Regulations</i> | Criterion met: The proposal is consistent with the Zoning Code requirements for lot area and width, setbacks, building height and lot coverage. |
| e) <i>Building Relationships and Quality Development</i> | Criterion met: The proposed modifications add visual interest and remove a dilapidated building from the site. |
| j) <i>Consistency with Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, Community Plan and other Policy Documents.</i> | Criterion met: The proposed modifications will positively contribute to the established aesthetic character of the Historic District. |

| Recommendation | | Approval |
|----------------|---|----------|
| Summary | ART has reviewed the proposed modifications with respect to the Zoning Code and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> and recommends approval with two conditions. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) That the proposed color scheme is chosen from a historic palette and is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood.2) That the landscape design of the site is consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on and adjacent to the site. | |

Architectural Review Board – Standards of Review

The following outlines the full text of the review criteria (summarized above) for all Architectural Review Board applications as outlined in Section 153.174(B) of the Dublin Zoning Code.

- (3) *General Character*
 - (a) The design of new structures and of additions to existing structures, including new site improvements, shall take into account the architectural style, general design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of other structures and site within the District and immediate vicinity.
 - (b) Where changes have taken place in the course of time as evidence of the history and development of adjacent or nearby buildings, structures or sites, if these changes are deemed to have acquired significance and would be compromised by the proposed new development, then this significance shall be recognized and respected in the design of the new development.
- (4) *Architectural Style.* There are a number of intermixes of architectural styles, as well as a larger number of buildings of such modest nature or so extensively remodeled to effectively lose all architectural importance. It is with reference to the basic architectural character of the key buildings noted above that the need for compatibility in the future construction in the District should be made. Compatibility does not infer imitation, but rather an appropriate design in terms of scale, building materials and detail. The architectural character of the various areas of the District consists mainly of four themes:
 - (a) Simple rectangular commercial buildings with exterior construction of rubble or random Ashlar limestone, one, one and one-half, or two stories high with gable roof and ridgeline parallel to the street, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
 - (b) Simple rectangular commercial buildings and outbuildings with exterior construction of frame with horizontal siding and corner trim, one, one and one-half, or two stories high with gable roof and ridgeline parallel to the street, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
 - (c) Residential buildings with exterior construction of rubble or random Ashlar limestone, or red brick laid up in common bond, or frame with horizontal siding and corner trim, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
 - (d) Residential buildings with stone on facades, one to one-half stories, mainly of the era 1950-1970.
- (5) *Massing and Building Form.* Massing of new buildings shall be generally similar to those in adjacent and nearby buildings. Building forms should generally reflect those of the architectural style of the building and the Historic District. Variations of gabled roof forms are preferred. Window to wall ratios should be appropriate to the type and use of building constructed.
- (6) *Color.* Traditional colors and combinations of those colors that are both identified with the origin or the era in which the structure or property was originally built and approved by the Architectural Review Board shall be used for exteriors for all new structures to be built, and reconstruction, remodeling and exterior maintenance of existing structures within the Architectural Review District. Fluorescent or luminescent colors are prohibited.

- (7) *Signs.* Signs should be designed to complement the nineteenth century Early American character of the district by incorporating design features common to signs from the 1800s. Materials should complement the architectural character of the District and colors should consistent with the era of the building. Sign types consistent with the character of the Historic District include wall, projecting, window, awning, and sandwich boards.
 - (8) *Landscaping.* The landscape design of the site should be consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on the site. Plant material and methods for installation shall be selected respecting the nature of the urban environment and the survivability and diversity of the plan species. Non-plant material shall be of a type associated with the origin or era in which the structure was originally built. Significant features of the original landscape, e.g., stone walls, shall be preserved.
 - (9) *Archaeological.* Every reasonable effort shall be made to record, protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any project.
- (C) *Alterations to Buildings, Structure and Site.* In addition to the General Review Standards, the following shall be met by applications for alterations to existing buildings, outbuildings, structures, and sites prior to approval of a Board Order.
- (1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure that the use of the property will involve minimal alteration of an existing building, structure or site and its environment.
 - (2) The alteration shall conform to the distinguishing, original exterior qualities or character of the structure, its site, and its environment.
 - (3) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a period building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural or environmental features should be avoided when possible.
 - (4) All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original integrity of the building shall be discouraged.
 - (5) Whereas changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment, if these changes are deemed to have acquired significance, then this significance shall be recognized and respected.
 - (6) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.
 - (7) Significant architectural features which have deteriorated should be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities whenever possible. Repair or replacement of architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of the feature, and if possible, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

- (8) The surface cleaning of structures, if provided as part of the application, shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials should be avoided.
- (D) *Additions to Existing Buildings, Structures, and Site.* In addition to the General Review Standards, the following shall be met by applications for additions to existing buildings, outbuildings, structures, and site prior to approval of a Board Order.
 - (1) Materials for additions should be traditional to the District, but need not match those of the original structure to which the addition is attached.
 - (2) Contemporary design for additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when they do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural materials, and the design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment. Roofline additions are discouraged or should be placed and designed to have the least amount of visual impact.
 - (2) Additions should be clearly distinguishable from the original structure by keeping additions at a smaller scale where appropriate or other similar measures. The intent of an addition should be that if the additions or alterations were removed the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired. Additions should generally be located to the rear of the original building so that the most significant and visible faces of historic properties are given priority. Additions to the front should be clearly separated from the original building and simplified in design to not detract from the historic aspects of the structure.
 - (3) All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Additions with no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original integrity of the building shall be discouraged.